



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

affect not alone the parties litigant, but the public who believe in speedy justice, and especially the taxpayers of the state who foot the bills for criminal prosecutions. To give a criminal a fair trial is mandatory and righteous. The taxpayer knows the great expense of this also, but does not complain. It is where he is forced to repeat payment of the same bill because of some trifling, harmless error, which could in no manner have affected the result, and where the prisoner's guilt has been clearly shown, that the shoe pinches, and Mr. Taxpayer objects, and, it may be added, that his objection is generally overruled. However, courts are adjusting themselves to meet this objection fairly. The Criminal Court of Appeals of Oklahoma, even though Oklahoma as a state is yet in her infancy, has taken the lead. An example is found in the recent case of *Gonzalus v. State*, 123 Pacific Reporter, 705. The court says: "The habit of reversing cases upon light and trivial grounds is to be reprehended from every standpoint. While it is true that a price should never be placed upon the administration of justice, and no man who has been unjustly convicted should ever be denied a rehearing simply upon the ground of the expense of a second trial, yet this court will take judicial notice of the fact that the people of this state are already heavily burdened with taxation, and that one of the principal items of expense to the state is the enforcement of its criminal laws. It would therefore be unjust to the people of this state to add to this expense by reversing convictions and sending cases back for retrial, and thereby greatly increasing the expenses of the government, unless a necessity for doing so really existed."

Coasting Is Not a Nuisance.—Does coasting on a bobsled constitute a public nuisance so as to preclude recovery in case of an injury to the person so enjoying himself? A case answering this question is *Lynch v. Public Service Corporation*, 83 Atlantic Reporter, 382. The plaintiff, a girl of 13 years, was riding down a city hill with a number of other persons. The defendant is a street car company, running cars on a street which intersects the street on which the coasting was taking place. On plaintiff's third trip down the hill the accident occurred by the bobsled coming into collision with one of defendant's cars. Plaintiff was injured, and seeks damages. The trial resulted in a nonsuit, the court holding that the coasting was a nuisance and an improper use of the highway. On appeal to the Court of Errors and Appeals of New Jersey this holding is reversed, the court saying: "We cannot concede that coasting upon a public street is an illegal act, so as to constitute it a public nuisance. Public highways are intended for pleasure uses as well as business uses; and it is difficult to see why a sled coasting down hill should be said to be a public nuisance any more than a sleigh drawn by horses going down the same highway. * * * 'As the sport is healthful and exhilarating, it seems sufficiently proper, if

the street is not put to other public use, that this diversion be allowed, if not expressly sanctioned. The sport itself is not entirely foreign to the purposes for which public ways are established; for the use of these ways for pleasure riding is perfectly legitimate, and coasting is only pleasure riding in a series of short trips repeated over the same road, not differing essentially from the riding in sleighs, of which so much is seen in the streets of Northern cities, when suitable weather and proper conditions invite their enjoyment.' ”